



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,889	07/07/2004	Ralf Noerenberg	254716US0PCT	8794
22850	7590	08/17/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER	
			MRUK, BRIAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/17/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,889

Applicant(s)

NOERENBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Brian P. Mruk

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/27/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's Remarks filed May 29, 2007.

Claim 15 has been amended. Currently, claims 15-28 remain pending in the application.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office actions, Paper Nos. 20060418, 20061002 and 20070215.

3. The rejection of claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and remarks.

4. The rejection of claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Evers et al, EP 616,026, is maintained for the reasons of record.

5. The rejection of claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Oldenhove et al, EP 620,270 is maintained for the reasons of record.

Art Unit: 1751

6. The rejection of claims 15-28 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,412 is maintained for the reasons of record.

## **NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, applicant does not have support for the phrase "such that at least 50% of the sum of homologs" that is recited in newly amended claim 15. The examiner notes that applicant's specification and remarks provide support for the sum of the homologs to be 64.3%, but this does not provide support for "at least 50%" that is recited in newly amended claim 15.

Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

Art Unit: 1751

9. Instant claims 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for being dependent upon claim 15.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed May 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant continues to argue that each of Evers et al, EP 616,026, and Oldenhove et al, EP 620,270, do not meet the requirements of the instant claims, since the references do not teach or suggest in general an alkylglycol alkoxylate or alkyldiglycol alkoxylate that is free from alcohol and contains the specific homolog distribution required in the instant claims. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the examiner maintains that Evers et al clearly discloses compositions in Examples I-VIII that do not contain alcohols. Also note that Examples 1A and 1C-1G of Oldenhove et al are free from alcohols, per the requirements of the instant invention. Furthermore, with respect to the newly added limitation concerning the homolog requirements, the examiner asserts that Evers et al and Oldenhove et al clearly disclose compositions that require only one specific compound (i.e. homolog), which would constitute 100% of the sum of all homologs. Specifically, the examiner maintains that the alkylglycol alkoxylates and alkyldiglycol alkoxylates disclosed in Evers et al, EP 616,026, and Oldenhove et al, EP 620,270, clearly meet the presently claimed alkylglycol alkoxylates and alkyldiglycol alkoxylates of the instant invention, since they are free from alcohol, and are obtained by the same process that is presently

Art Unit: 1751

claimed. Also, the examiner maintains that the product by process limitation recited in instant claim 15 would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the patentability of a product by process claim does not depend on its method of production and where the examiner has found a similar product, the burden rests with the applicant to prove that that product is patentably distinct. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289; *In re Pilkington*, 162 USPQ 145. "The lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes the determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not the process that must be established. We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685,688 (CCPA 1972).

Applicant continues to argue that the instant claims are not an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,412, since claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,412 prepares the alcohol alkoxylates by reacting an alcohol with an alkyl alkylene oxide. However, the examiner respectfully maintains that claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,412 discloses an alcohol alkoxylate of formula (I) that does not

Art Unit: 1751

contain an alcohol, and constitutes 100% of the sum of all homologs, as required in the instant claims.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BPM

Brian P Mruk  
August 12, 2007

*Brian P. Mruk*

Brian P Mruk  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751